

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 29619

Title: Slow pull and different conventional suction techniques in EUS-FNA of pancreatic solid lesions using 22-gauge needles

Reviewer's code: 02943694

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2016-08-23 10:36

Date reviewed: 2016-09-12 10:49

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting study about the low pull and different conventional suction techniques in EUS-FNA of pancreatic solid lesions using 22-gauge needles. EUS-FNA using a slow-pull technique has recently emerged as a new method to obtain tissue diagnosis for pancreatic diseases. However, the optimal suction technique has not been clearly established, and the efficacy of the slow-pull technique remains unclear. In this study, the authors evaluated the cytological diagnostic capacity and sample quality of the slow-pull technique and compare it with different conventional suction techniques. Overall, the study is well designed and the the results are good. 1 Some minor language polishing should be corrected. 2 The references are updated, however, it should be discussed more deeper. 3 Tables should be checked again.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

ESPS manuscript NO: 29619

Title: Slow pull and different conventional suction techniques in EUS-FNA of pancreatic solid lesions using 22-gauge needles

Reviewer's code: 03027803

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Date sent for review: 2016-08-23 10:36

Date reviewed: 2016-09-12 11:08

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting study. Some minor spelling mistakes should be corrected.